Plaintiff Richard Clark ("Plaintiff"), by and through his undersigned counsel, alleges, based on personal knowledge as to himself and his own acts, and, as to other matters, based on a information and belief, as follows:

THE PARTIES

1. This is a class action brought on behalf of all members enrolled in a Group

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. d/b/a CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield (hereinafter referred to as "CareFirst" or "Defendant CareFirst") group contract for health benefits, and who received covered emergency room services from an out-of-network provider and were billed for the balance of such services.

- 2. CareFirst, Inc. is the not-for-profit, non-stock, parent company of CareFirst of Maryland, Inc. and Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc., affiliates that do business as CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield. CareFirst serves nearly 3.4 million members.
- 3. CareFirst provides a comprehensive array of health insurance and managed care products and services primarily through indemnity health insurance, health maintenance organization (HMO) coverage and health benefits administration. Other products and services include preferred provider and point of service networks, fee-for-service arrangements, third-party administrator services, and other managed care services. These products and services are provided to individuals, businesses, and governmental agencies.
- 4. CareFirst is an employee benefit plan, as defined at 29 U.S.C. §§ 1002(1) and (3) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. §§ 1001, et seq.
- 5. Emergency Physicians Associates is a group practice specializing in emergency medicine located in San Jose, California.
- 6. The true names and capacities of Defendants sued as Does 1 though 10, inclusive, are unknown to Plaintiff at the time of the filing of this Complaint; though, upon information and belief, Plaintiff is aware of the existence additional Defendants, consisting of Out-of-Network or Non-Preferred Providers who balance-billed patients receiving emergency medical services pursuant to the Plan. Plaintiff, therefore, sues said Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiff will seek leave of Court to amend this Complaint when the true names of said Defendants have been ascertained after appropriate discovery.
- 7. Plaintiff is enrolled for health benefits in an employee benefit plan established or maintained by Plaintiff's employer, Targus Information Corporation ("Targus"), a Delaware Corporation engaged in commerce or an industry affecting commerce. The plan is maintained

for the purpose of providing for its participants or their beneficiaries, through the purchase of insurance or otherwise, medical, surgical and/or hospital care benefits.

- 8. Targus is designated the "plan administrator" pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1002(16)(A) of ERISA.
- 9. Plaintiff received from Targus health benefits through an employee benefit plan, Group No. 4F51, administered by CareFirst (the "Plan").
- 10. Plaintiff, a resident of Escondido, California, is a full-time, permanent employee of Targus and is enrolled in the Plan as a "subscriber" as defined in the Plan.
- 11. Plaintiff is a "participant" in the Plan, as defined at 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7) of ERISA.
- 12. CareFirst's employee benefit plan also provides coverage for eligible spouses and dependent children. At the time he received emergency services under the Plan, Plaintiff's dependent son was covered under the Plan as an eligible dependent child, as defined in the Plan.
- 13. Plaintiff's dependent son was a "beneficiary" in the Plan, as defined at 29 U.S.C. § 1002(8) of ERISA.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 14. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action pursuant to the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(1), and 28 U.S.C. § 1331. This Court has the supplemental jurisdiction over Plaintiff's state law claim pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 15. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e) in that the Plan is administered in this District and the breach giving rise to this Complaint occurred in this District.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

- 16. Plaintiff brings this action on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated. Plaintiff seeks to represent the following Class, initially defined as:
 - All members enrolled in a Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. d/b/a CareFirst BlueCross BlueShield employee benefit plan who visited an in-network emergency room for emergency services, received emergency room services from an out-of-network or non-participating provider, and were billed for the balance of such services from

February 8, 2006 to the present, including a subclass of California residents who were billed for the balance owing for emergency room services rendered by Emergency Physicians Associates. Excluded from the Class are Defendants, their parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates.

- 17. All Class members are hereinafter referred to as the "Class." Subject to additional information obtained through further investigation and discovery, the foregoing definition of the Class may be expanded or narrowed by amendment or subsequent amended complaint.
- 18. This action is brought and properly may be maintained as a class action, pursuant to the provisions of Rule 23(a), (b)(2) and (b)(3) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on behalf of all members of the Class:
- a. <u>Numerosity</u>: Members of the Class are so numerous that their individual joinder is impracticable. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that the proposed Class contains hundreds of members. The precise number of Class members is unknown to Plaintiff at this time. The true number of Class members is likely to be known by Defendant, however, and thus, may be notified of the pendency of this action by published notice or other alternative means.
- b. Existence and Predominance of Common Questions of Fact and Law:

 Common questions of fact and law exist as to all members of the Class. These questions

 predominate over any questions affecting individual Class members. These common factual and
 legal questions include, but are not limited to, the following:
 - i. Whether Defendant CareFirst's conduct constituted a violation of ERISA;
 - ii. Whether Class members are entitled to recover benefits due to them under the Plan;
 - iii. Whether Defendant Emergency Physician Associates' conduct constituted a violation of California's Knox-Keane Health Care Service Plan Act;
 - iv. Whether Defendants' conduct was unlawful within the meaning ofCalifornia's Unfair Competition Law;
 - Whether Defendants' conduct was unfair within the meaning of California's Unfair Competition Law;

- vi. Whether Class members lost money or property and were injured in fact as a result of Defendants' conduct;
- vii. Whether the Class is entitled to damages, restitution, and/or other relief.
- c. <u>Typicality</u>: Plaintiff's claims are typical of the claims of the Class since Plaintiff received covered emergency room services from an out-of-network or non-participating provider and was billed by the provider for the balance owing between what CareFirst incorrectly paid as benefits under the Plan and the provider's total charges. More specifically, CareFirst paid as emergency room benefits under the Plan an amount other than 100% of the allowed benefit as called for by the Plan, leaving Plaintiff responsible for the balance due to the provider.
- d. Adequacy: Plaintiff is an adequate representative of the Class because his interests do not conflict with the interests of the Class he seeks to represent; he has retained counsel competent and highly experienced in complex class action litigation; and he intends to prosecute this action vigorously. The interests of the Class will be fairly and adequately protected by Plaintiff and his counsel.
- e. <u>Superiority</u>: A class action is superior to other available means of fair and efficient adjudication of the claims of Plaintiff and members of the Class. The injury suffered by each individual Class members is relatively small in comparison to the burden and expense of individual prosecution of the complex and extensive litigation necessitated by Defendants' conduct. Defendants have acted and/or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, thereby making appropriate final injunctive and other equitable relief in favor of Plaintiff and the Class. In addition, the prosecution of separate actions by individual Class members presents a potential for inconsistent and contradictory judgments that may establish incompatible standards of conduct for Defendants. Individualized litigation increases the delay and expense to all parties, and to the court system, as a result of the complex legal and factual issues of the case. By contrast, the class action device presents far fewer management difficulties, and provides the benefits of single adjudication, economy of scale, and comprehensive supervision by a single court.

f. Manageability: Whatever difficulties may exist in the management of this class action will be greatly outweighed by the salutary benefits of the class action procedure, including but not limited to providing Class members with a method for redress of claims that may not otherwise warrant individual litigation.

SUBSTANTIVE FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 19. The CareFirst Plan is an employee benefit plan established for Targus employees. The Plan offers participants and their beneficiaries medical, surgical and/or hospital care benefits.
- 20. The Plan requires that Targus employees meet specified eligibility requirements in order to receive coverage under the Plan. For example, the Plan specifies that a "subscriber" (i.e., eligible employee) must be a "permanent, bone-fide employee" of Targus employed on a "regular, year-round basis." Upon meeting the coverage eligibility requirements, the employee also must timely enroll in the Plan.
- 21. The Plan also permits a subscriber to enroll his or her dependents, such as a spouse or dependent child, in the Plan, provided certain eligibility requirements are met.
 - 22. CareFirst enrolled Plaintiff and his dependent son in the Plan on August 27, 2007.
- 23. Since their initial enrollment, Plaintiff and his dependent son were continuously enrolled in and received coverage under the Plan, until October 1, 2009, at which time Plaintiff's dependent son was no longer eligible for coverage pursuant to the Plan's terms. Plaintiff remains a "subscriber" and "participant" in the Plan.
- 23. The Plan's Certificate of Coverage contains a "Description of Covered Services" at Attachment A (Addendum). Section 1.1 of Attachment A states:
 - 1.1 Benefits Under the Preferred Provider Plan: The Preferred Provider Plan offers two levels of benefits . . . Under the Preferred Provider Plan, you may receive benefits for a particular service under either the In-Network component or the Out-of-Network component. You may not receive duplicate benefits for the same service.
 - 24. Section 1.2 of Attachment A describes In-Network benefits:
 - 1.2 In-Network Benefits: When In-Network benefits apply, you are eligible for a higher level of benefits than the Out-of-Network benefits. In-Network benefits apply in the following instances:

- a. Services Rendered By a Preferred Provider: When you use a Preferred Provider, benefits are based on the appropriate Allowed Benefit. The level of benefits is reflected in Attachment B of the Certificate, the Schedule of Benefits. Preferred Providers will submit claims to us directly for covered services. The Preferred Provider will accept 100% of the Allowed Benefit as full payment for covered services.
- b. Other Circumstances: In-Network benefits also apply in the following instance: (i) In any case in which covered services are provided to you by and Health Care Facility or Health Care Practitioner (whether or not a Preferred Provider) for the treatment of an accidental injury or medical emergency, benefits will be available for such services to the same extent as if such Health Care Facility or Health Care Practitioner were a Preferred Provider. In this instance, benefits are based on the appropriate Allowed Benefit for the service or supply provided. The level of benefits (i.e., coinsurance and/or copayment) for these Providers' services will be those shown under In-Network Benefits in Attachment B of the Certificate, the Schedule of Benefits. You may be responsible for amounts in excess of the Plan Allowance for these services.

(emphasis added).

- 25. Attachment B to the Certificate of Coverage is titled "Schedule of Benefits." In the Schedule of Benefits, CareFirst lists general Plan benefit features, such as in-network and out-of-network deductibles and out-of-pocket limits, and benefit Plan allowances.
- 26. In the "Outpatient Hospital Services" section of the Schedule of Benefits appears the Plan benefits breakdown for "Emergency Room Treatment."
- 27. According to the Schedule of Benefits, as amended, In-Network "Emergency Room Treatment" services are covered under the Plan at "100% of the Allowed Benefit, minus a Member Co-payment of \$50 per visit."
- 28. For a Preferred Provider, "Allowed Benefit" is defined as the lesser of "the actual charge" or "the amount CareFirst allows for the service in effect on the date the service is rendered." "The benefit is payable to the provider and is accepted as payment in full, except for any applicable Deductible, Copayment and Coinsurance amounts, for which the Member is responsible."
 - 29. On September 21, 2008, Plaintiff's dependent son and Plan beneficiary, Brett

Clark, visited his local emergency room at O'Connor Hospital in San Jose, California for treatment of a broken hand.

- 30. On October 16, 2008, CareFirst received claims for benefits under the Plan, submitted by Plaintiff through his employer. Claim number 9027W06879 pertained to the hospital emergency room facility charges. Claim number 8290W05254 pertained to charges incurred by Emergency Physician Associates.
- 31. The fees incurred for the emergency room visit totaled \$2,815.00. The facility charge payable to the hospital emergency room totaled \$1,722. The physician's charges incurred by Emergency Physician Associates for the emergency room visit totaled \$1,093.
- 32. CareFirst covered the emergency room's facility charge at 100%, less the \$50 co-payment, in accordance with Plan requirements.
- 33. However, as detailed in the Explanation of Benefits ("EOB") form relating to Emergency Physicians Associates' services, CareFirst paid only \$246.96 of the \$1,093 in physician charges, leaving Plaintiff responsible for payment of the remaining \$846.04 balance.
- 34. CareFirst's EOB explains that Emergency Physician Associates' charges are "over our plan allowance" for these services. "This non-allowed amount is included in the member responsibility amount and the provider may collect the non-allowed amount from the member. Payments included with this EOB are reimbursement for covered health services rendered by a non-participating provider. It is the member's responsibility to pay the provider for these services."
- 35. Emergency Physicians Associates billed Plaintiff for the \$846.04 balance not paid by CareFirst.
- 36. As evidenced by letter dated on or about January 30, 2009, CareFirst received Plaintiff's timely written appeal, submitted in accordance with Plan requirements. CareFirst was notified that Plaintiff appealed the treatment of the claim relating to the coverage for emergency room services provided by Emergency Physician Associates and requested additional reimbursement in accordance with the Plan terms.
 - 37. By letter dated June 4, 2009, CareFirst denied Plaintiff's appeal, notifying

Plaintiff that "[t]his is a Final Adverse Decision. You may be financially liable for this claim."

- 38. CareFirst denied Plaintiff's appeal because "[i]t has been determined that the claim processed correctly according to the terms of your contract emergency services benefit, at 100% of the plan allowance." However, the denial letter continued by citing to Section 1.2(b)(i) of the General Provisions section of the Plan ("In-Network Benefits, Other Circumstances"), which provides In-Network benefits for the treatment of accidental injury or medical emergency to the same extent as if the Health Care Facility or Health Care Practitioner was a Preferred Provider, regardless of whether the treating Health Care Facility or Health Care Practitioner actually is a Preferred Provider.
- 39. In early August of 2009, CareFirst received a second letter from Plaintiff appealing the denial of benefits determination contained in CareFirst's June 4, 2009 letter.
 - 40. CareFirst has not responded to Plaintiff's second appeal.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION (Recovery of Benefits, ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B)) (Against Defendant CareFirst)

- 41. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above.
- 42. Plaintiff asserts this Cause of Action individually and on behalf of all members of the Class against Defendant CareFirst for the recovery of benefits due for emergency room services, as defined by the Plan.
- 43. CareFirst is an employee benefit plan, as defined at 29 U.S.C. §§ 1002(1) and (3) of ERISA.
- 44. Plaintiff is a "participant" in the CareFirst employee benefit plan, as defined at 29 U.S.C. § 1002(7) of ERISA.
- 45. Plaintiff's dependent son is a "beneficiary" in the CareFirst employee benefit plan, as defined at 29 U.S.C. § 1002(8) of ERISA.
- 46. As set forth herein, CareFirst's acts and practices of not providing In-Network benefits for emergency room services to the same extent as if the Health Care Facility or Health Care Practitioner was a Preferred Provider, regardless of whether the treating Health Care

 Facility or Health Care Practitioner actually is a Preferred Provider, are contrary to the plain language of the Plan terms.

- 47. Pursuant to § 1132(a)(1)(B) of ERISA, Plaintiff seeks to recover benefits due to him under the terms of his plan, to enforce his rights under the terms of his plan, and to clarify his rights to future benefits under the terms of his plan.
- 48. Plaintiff seeks recovery of attorneys' fees and costs of litigation pursuant to § 1132(g)(1) of ERISA.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION

(For Violations of California Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 17200, et seq.)
(Against Defendants CareFirst, Emergency Physicians Associates and Does 1-10)

- 49. Plaintiff realleges and incorporates each and every allegation set forth in the paragraphs above.
- 50. Plaintiff asserts this Cause of Action individually and on behalf of all members of the Class against Defendants CareFirst and Emergency Physicians Associates for unlawful and unfair business practices, as defined by California Business and Professions Code, §§ 17200, et seq.
- 51. Defendants' conduct violates California Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq. The acts and practices of Defendants constitute a common continuous and continuing course of conduct of unfair competition by means of unlawful and unfair business acts or practices within the meaning of Section 17200.
- 52. Defendants' acts and practices are unlawful because they violate California law, including the Knox-Keane Health Care Service Plan Act of 1975, Health & Safety Code, §§ 1340, et seq., ("Knox-Keane Act") in that Defendants balance-billed Plaintiff for the difference between the amount billed by Emergency Physicians Associates for emergency room services and the amount paid by CareFirst for those services. Defendants are emergency health care providers subject to the Knox-Keane Act.
- 53. Defendants' conduct not only violates the unlawful prong of Section 17200, but also constitutes a violation of Section 17200's "unfair" prong. Defendants' conduct is "unfair" in that it offends public policy, is immoral, unscrupulous, unethical, deceitful and offensive, and

.21

causes substantial injury to Plaintiff and members of the Class. Defendants' conduct also undermines or violates the policies embodied in the Knox-Keane Act—one of which is to prevent the placement of patients in the middle of billing disputes between doctors and health care service plans—thus providing a sufficient predicate for Plaintiff's claim for unfair business practices.

- 54. Defendants' conduct causes substantial injury to Plaintiff and the Class because, as a result of such conduct, patients receiving emergency medical services are forced to pay the balance of the bills for emergency medical services provided by out-of-network health care providers and/or facilities, including Emergency Physicians Associates, but not paid by CareFirst, in contravention of California law.
- 55. Plaintiff and Class members are entitled to full restitution of the amounts they paid to satisfy the balance of bills incurred in connection with their receipt of emergency medical services.
- 56. Plaintiff seeks an order enjoining Defendants CareFirst and Emergency Physicians Associates from continuing to engage in unlawful and unfair business practices, and any other act prohibited by law. Plaintiff also seeks an order awarding attorneys' fees and costs pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure Section 1021.5.
- 57. Plaintiff and the Class have suffered injury in the form of actionable losses of money as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful and unfair business practices.
- 58. Plaintiff seeks an order for restitution compelling Defendant Emergency

 Physicians Associates to return the monies it wrongfully obtained as a result of its unlawful and
 unfair practices, such monies in good conscience properly belonging to him and those other
 persons in interest from whom the money was improperly taken.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays that this Court enter judgment on his behalf adjudging and decreeing that:

A. This action may be maintained as a class action under Federal Rule of Civil

1	K. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.								
2	DATED: February 8, 2010	Respectfully submitted,							
3	:	GREEN WELLING, P.C.							
4									
5		By:							
6		Brian S. Umpierre							
7		595 Market Street, Suite 2750 San Francisco, CA 94105							
8		Telephone: (415) 477-6700 Facsimile: (415) 477-6710							
9	ı								
10		Bradley Ian Berger BERGER ATTORNEY P.C. 321 Broadway							
11		New York, NY 10007 Telephone: (800) 529-4444 Facsimile: (888) 529-4448							
12		Facsimile: (888) 529-4448							
13		Attorneys for Plaintiff							
14									
15		•							
16									
17									
18									
19 20									
21									
22									
23	•								
24									
25									
26									

28

ORIGINAL

SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS	DEFENDANTS OFFR OFFR 3: 49 Group Hosp. & Med. Services, Inc. d/b/a/ CareFirst BlueCross						
Clark, Richard			Group Hosp. & BlueShield; Err				
(b) County of Residence	e of First Listed Plaintiff San Diego		County of Residence	of First Listed	d'Defendant DIST	RICT OF CA	LIFORINA
(1	EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)		1 18		LAINTIFF CASES		
			1 4	INVOLVED:	IATION CASES, US	SE THE LOCAT	DE PUTY
(c) Attorney's (Firm Nam	e, Address, and Telephone Number)	•	Attorneys (If Known)				
Jenelle Welling, Green	Welling, P.C., 595 Market St., Suite 2	2750,	240.0	W 0 7	ZZ PEN	1	BLM
San Francisco, CA 941	05 (415-477-6700)				33 BEN		
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. C	TIZENSHIP OF I	PRINCIPA	L PARTIES		
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	Citiz		TF DEF	Incorporated or Pri	incipal Place	for Defendant) PTF DEF 0 4 0 4
2 U.S. Government	☐ 4 Diversity	Citiz	ી cn of Another State 🗀] 2	Incorporated and P		
Defendant	(Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	""	an of Athonici State L		of Business In A		נים נים
•		Citiz	en or Subject of a	3 0 3	Foreign Nation		0606
TY NAMYIND OF CAN			reign Country				
IV. NATURE OF SUI	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	com relaviros	A STATE OF THE STA	of months of the control		I mente de la constante	NE COMMENTE MANAGEMENT AND AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY OF TH
O 110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY PERSONAL INJURY		DREEFRURE/PENAVIALL O Agriculture	1	al 28 USC 158	1	
☐ 120 Marine	☐ 310 Airplane ☐ 362 Personal Injury	- 0 62	0 Other Food & Drug	☐ 422 Appe		410 Antitru	leapportionment ist
☐ 130 Miller Act ☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument	☐ 315 Airplane Product Med. Malpracti Liability ☐ 365 Personal Injury		5 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881	28 US	SC 157		and Banking
☐ 150 Recovery of Overpayment	☐ 320 Assault, Libel & Product Liabilit	ty 🗆 63	0 Liquor Laws	MRROBER	IDYARIGHUSILAS		
& Enforcement of Judgment I 151 Medicare Act	Slander Slande		0 R.R. & Truck 0 Airline Regs.	□ 820 Copyt	rights	☐ 470 Rackete	eer Influenced and
☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	Liability Liability		0 Occupational	☐ 830 Paten		480 Consum	t Organizations ner Credit
Student Loans (Excl. Veterans)	☐ 340 Marine PERSONAL PROPE! ☐ 345 Marine Product ☐ 370 Other Fraud		Safety/Health O Other			(J 490 Cable/S	
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpayment	Liability 371 Truth in Lendin		O Other	SOCIAL	SECURITY	☐ 810 Selectiv ☐ 850 Securiti	ve Service ies/Commodities/
of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 380 Other Personal ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Property Damag	0 71	0 Fair Labor Standards	□ 861 HIA (1395ff)	Exchan	gc
☐ 190 Other Contract	Product Liability 385 Property Damag	0 72	Act 0 Labor/Mgmt. Relations	☐ 862 Black ☐ 863 DIWC	Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g))	☐ 875 Custom 12 USC	
☐ 195 Contract Product Liability ☐ 196 Franchise	☐ 360 Other Personal Product Liability		0 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting	☐ 864 SSID	Title XVI	題 890 Other S	Statutory Actions
REAL PROPERTY	Injury REPUBLISHED SPRISONER PERFITION	NS 0 74	& Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act	3 865 RSI (4	105(g)) (C/PAX/SUMS##	891 Agricul 892 Econom	ltural Acts nic Stabilization A
 210 Land Condemnation 	☐ 441 Voting ☐ 510 Motions to Vace	ite 🗆 79	0 Other Labor Litigation	☐ 870 Taxes	(U.S. Plaintiff	☐ 893 Enviro	nmental Matters
☐ 220 Foreclosure ☐ 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	☐ 442 Employment Sentence ☐ 443 Housing/ Habeas Corpus:	0 79	I Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act	or De ☐ 871 IRS—	fendant)		Allocation Act on of Information
240 Torts to Land	Accommodations 530 General			26 US	C 7609	Act	
 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property 	☐ 444 Welfare ☐ 535 Death Penalty ☐ 540 Mandamus & O	ther (1 46	MIMMIGRATION 7222 2 Naturalization Application	*	ļ		of Fee Determinati Equal Access
• *	Employment]□ 46	3 Habeas Corpus -	'		to Justic	
	 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - D 555 Prison Condition Other 		Alien Detaince 5 Other Immigration			☐ 950 Constitu State St	
	440 Other Civil Rights	"	Actions			State St	atures
				ł			
□ 2 Re	ate Court Appellate Court	Reop	ened speci	ferred from er district fy)	☐ 6 Multidistri	ict 🛮 7 $_{ m N}^{ m J}$	Appeal to Distric Judge from Magistrate Judgment
VI CAHOE OF ACT	Citc the U.S. Civil Statute under which you a Employee Retirement Income S	ecurity	uo not cite jurisdiction: Act, 29 U.S.C. 11.	at statutes un 32, 28 U.S	Jess diversity) 3.C. 1331, 28	U.S.C. 13	67
VI. CAUSE OF ACTION	Brief description of cause: For benefits due under employe	e benet		ation of C	alitornia's Un	tair Compe	etition Law
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	N DI	EMAND \$		IECK YES only i IRY DEMAND:	f demanded in Yes	complaint:
VIII. RELATED CAS	E(S) (See instructions): JUDGE			DOCKET	NUMBER		
DATE	SIGNATURE OF A	TORNEY (OF RECORD			` -	
02/08/2010	(-UM)	1	人		R	YF	ΔY
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	1	ZNAL					
RECEIPT # 1000 AI	MOUNT 850- APPLYING IFP			$\overline{}$	MAG. JUD	GE	
R	MOUNT 550 APPLYING IFP						

Court Name: USDC California Southern

1 771

Division: 3

Receipt Number: CAS010090

Cashier ID: mbain

Transaction Date: 02/10/2010

Payer Name: ONE LEGAL

TUTE CTI INC CCC

CIVIL FILING FEE

For: CLARK V GROUP HOSP

Case/Party: D-CAS-3-10-CV-000333-001

Amount: \$350.00

CHECK

Check/Money Order Num: D3136079

Amt Tendered: \$350.00

Total Due: \$350.00 Total Tendered: \$350.00

Change Amt: \$0.00

There will be a fee of \$45.00 charged for any returned check.